

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

William Von Long, ) Case No. 4:22-cv-116-DCC  
 )  
Petitioner, )  
 )  
v. ) **ORDER**  
 )  
Deloris Ann Shepard, )  
 )  
Respondent. )  
 )

---

Petitioner, proceeding pro se, is seeking habeas corpus relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), (D.S.C.), this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation (“Report”). On March 1, 2022, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the Petition be dismissed without prejudice and without requiring Respondent to file a return. ECF No. 11. The Magistrate Judge advised Petitioner of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Petitioner filed a response to the Report and a letter. ECF Nos. 13, 15.

**APPLICABLE LAW**

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the

Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation” (citation omitted)).

### ANALYSIS

The Magistrate Judge recommends summary dismissal of the instant Petition because it is a successive and unauthorized § 2254 action. In his response and letter Petitioner does not dispute the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. Nevertheless, out of an abundance of caution for a pro se Petitioner and in light of the fact that Petitioner has filed documents in response to the Report, the undersigned has conducted a *de novo* review of the record, the Report, and the applicable law. Upon such review, the Court finds that Petitioner's instant Petition is uncontroversially successive under § 2244(b), given that it was filed after the Court ruled on his first § 2254 action. Therefore, Petitioner was required to obtain leave from the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit prior to filing this action. § 2244(b)(3)(A). Because Petitioner failed to obtain authorization from the Fourth Circuit before filing this action, this Court lacks jurisdiction to consider his Petition. See *United States v. Winestock*, 340 F.3d 200, 205–06 (4th Cir. 2003).

Therefore, after considering the record in this case, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge, the Court agrees with the Report's recommendation. The Petition is **DISMISSED** without prejudice to Petitioner's right to seek authorization from the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals to file a successive petition, and without requiring Respondent to file an answer or return.<sup>1</sup>

**CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

"The district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant." Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a petitioner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336–38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate *both* that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484–85. In this case, the Court concludes that Petitioner has failed to make the requisite showing of "the denial of a constitutional right."

IT IS SO ORDERED.

---

<sup>1</sup> In the letter filed by Petitioner, it appears he is requesting authorization to file a successive § 2254 petition. ECF No. 15. He addressed the letter to "United States District Court[,] Fourth Circuit." ECF No. 15-1. The undersigned declines to address this demand because it is within the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals' authority to grant such a request.

s/ Donald C. Coggins, Jr.  
United States District Judge

March 24, 2022  
Spartanburg, South Carolina